



**Applicant : Mr J Broderick**

Following detailed debate it was resolved to object to this application. The clerk was given detailed instructions to draw up the details of the objection which was finalised after the meeting. The full comment is in the appendix to these minutes.

Proposed: Sadie Densham                      Seconded: Tim Doughty  
4 - In Favour Abstention                      1- Abstention

The final comment submitted to Wychavon District Council:

- ii     **Application Number : W/26/00739/FUL**  
**Location: Land At (OS 9778 5515)**  
**New Road,**  
**Flyford Flavell**

**Proposal for 2no. dwellings (one self build) and associated works.**

**Applicant : Mr & Mrs Bennett**

Following detailed debate it was resolved to object to this application. The clerk was given detailed instructions to draw up the details of the objection which was finalised after the meeting. The full comment is in the appendix to these minutes.

Proposed: Sadie Densham                      Seconded: Alison Crickmore  
5 - In Favour

The final comment submitted to Wychavon District Council

- lii    **Application Number: W/26/00388/FUL**  
**Location: The Homestead**  
**Bishampton Road**  
**Flyford Flavell**  
**WR7 4BU**

**Proposed replacement self-build dwelling with garage and office/store over and relocated access.**

**Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ellis**

Following detailed debate it was resolved to object to this application. The clerk was given detailed instructions to draw up the details of the objection which was finalised after the meeting. The full comment is in the appendix to these minutes.

Proposed: David Waide  
5 - In Favour

Seconded: Richard Croxton

**18. Any Other Business**

None

**Date of Next Meeting**

19<sup>th</sup> May 2026

Signed:

Date:

## **Appendix**

**Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and North Piddle Parish Council  
W/25/01449/FUL  
Meadow Croft, Bishampton Road, Flyford Flavell, WR7 4BT  
Land At (OS 9819 5481) Bishampton Road Flyford Flavell**

**Restarted application 10<sup>th</sup> April 2026**

The Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and North Piddle Parish Council object to this application.

Please note that the Parish Council stands by its previous comments submitted 6<sup>th</sup> August 2025 and these additional comments should be read alongside those already submitted.

The Parish Council does not consider that the proposed amendments to the layout improve the scheme and there are a number of questions still unanswered that need to be addressed:

There is still doubt that the drainage of the site will work. Although a SUDS has been introduced into the scheme it is proposed that both foul and storm water should discharge into the Severn Trent sewer in Bishampton Lane. The SUDS will act to control the flow of water into the sewer to regulate the discharge. However, there is no evidence that Severn Trent have been consulted on this scheme and will allow storm water to be discharged into the system.

The SUDS is also located close to houses on Flyford Green and could pose a threat to flooding should the system overflow. This is considered to be an unacceptable risk posed by this planned development.

The Parish Council would reiterate its concerns about the density of the proposed development. The previous scheme seemed cramped and out of character with the village; this scheme is even more cramped and unworkable. There is insufficient on-site parking which will lead to overflow parking on the Bishampton Road and there is very restricted amenity area. There are only 2 visitor parking spaces for instance. A cursory look at the ariel view of Flyford Flavel clearly shows that the development is not in keeping with the layout and density of the village.

The SWDPR calls for a minimum density of 30 houses per hectare but this is qualified in the SWDPR 16 and in the Reasoned Justification that follows:

Para G states that in sensitive areas the density may be adjusted downwards as appropriate to ensure that impact is minimised.

This is a site which abuts open countryside and housing of a much lower density.

The adjacent Flyford Green built 12 years ago has a density of 16 houses per hectare and if the Green itself is included that drops to 12. This development is incongruous in the location and Reasoned Justification 16.3 states - A more flexible approach is taken outside the urban areas and "These levels are subject to the density criteria set out in the policy, which ensure the SWDPR provides flexibility and responsiveness to local circumstances, including infrastructure capacity to support the development. Site density will be measured in terms of the number of dwellings per hectare, based on the net developable area, taking into consideration site character analysis and other policy constraints, e.g., delivery of GI and public open space."

This site does not propose any open space and it is clear from the revisions that it is struggling to include the necessary infrastructure within the confines of the site.

The Parish Council therefore considers this proposal to be out of character with the village and imposes an unwanted urbanisation for no gain. SWDPR 07 states that "Housing proposals are required to contribute towards the provision, maintenance, improvement and connectivity of multi-functional Green Infrastructure". This proposal does none of these things and provides no additional benefits to village life.

The parish Council has raised landscape concerns in its previous comment and although the SWDP has been updated, consider these comments to be still relevant. A recent application for PIP (W/26/00358/PIP) within the village has been refused on landscape grounds. There is no discernible difference between the two applications.

The Parish Council wish to draw the officer's attention to the allocation of housing for Flyford Flavell in the SWDPR. This site was identified in the

Strategic Housing Allocation for the SWDPR for 12 houses. The village has recently had a planning application for 14 houses approved (W/25/01891/FUL) which fulfils the village allocation for the life of the SWDPR. No further housing is required as the Five Year Land Supply is now up to date.

Should the planning authority be minded to approve this application the Parish Council ask for the matter to be referred to committee for further deliberation.

Furthermore, if approval is granted there should be a comprehensive condition to control the discharge of foul and storm water to the site such as the following:

Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of a scheme for the provision of foul drainage for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall:

- Include the design of all on and off-site foul sewerage infrastructure, the diameters of proposed pipes and the capacity of any on or off-site storage;
- Include a timetable and programme for the provision of the foul sewerage infrastructure; and
- Demonstrate that, where connection to a public sewer is proposed, the additional foul sewerage discharge can be accommodated within the public sewer system without increasing the risk of flooding or backing up of the existing system on the site or elsewhere.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the approved timetable and programme.

No works or development shall take place until a Construction Surface Water Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include how surface water will be managed during the construction phase, including site clearance, soil stripping and pond amendments. The plan shall include drawings of any temporary drainage systems, a timeline of construction and measures to mitigate the risk of pollution (including silt) of the water environment and offsite flood risk. The plan shall detail how the approved permanent surface water drainage system shall be remediated during the construction phase. The approved construction surface water management plan shall be implemented as soon as works start on site and thereafter maintained during the full duration of the construction phase.

**Application Number : W/26/00739/FUL**  
**Location: Land At (OS 9778 5515)**  
**New Road,**

## **Flyford Flavell**

### **Proposal for 2no. dwellings (one self build) and associated works.**

#### **Applicant : Mr & Mrs Bennett**

- 1/. This application follows a PIP which was approved at Appeal in June 2024. The original PIP application was refused by Wychavon District Council (W/23/01628/PIP) for a number of reasons. The parish Council also opposed the application and submitted a detailed comment.
- 2/. The inspector agreed with every point raised by the LPA and Parish Council but allowed the appeal (3331154) on the basis that there was no Five Year Land Supply. The Land Supply is now in place due to the adoption of the SWDPR and so there is no reason to approve this application.
- 3/. It is further noted that the position of the houses has moved and do not follow the linear form of the village. The red and blue outlines of the present application do not follow the position of the lines on the PIP application and so this cannot be considered to be a direct follow on from the PIP approved at appeal.
- 4/. The position of the self-build house is a concern as it is close to an existing property. The Parish Council reiterate its landscape and other concerns first raised in 2023 as follows:
- 5/. The parish council opposes this application for very much the same reasons that it opposed application 23/01134/PIP on Radford Road which was refused on 4<sup>th</sup> August 23 and has subsequently been refused a further two times. The Parish Council emphasizes the following objections concerning the location and sustainability of the site and the proposal.
- 6/. The development would have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the area. It would extend beyond the present boundary of the village but create a green gap to the north where in time it would be difficult to resist further development.
- 7/. The site is outside the village boundary, in the open countryside parish of North Piddle and should not be connected with the village for planning purposes. It is also noted that in the Village hierarchy in the revised SWDP, Flyford Flavell has been downgraded to a category 3 village.
- 8/. There is very poor drainage in the area and the opportunities for dealing with foul water waste is limited. (The Flyford Flavell sewage system is presently overloaded). The Parish Council does not know of any water course or other means of disposing of grey water from this site. It is restricted in size and the development of 2 houses would certainly mean there is no room for percolation of the waste water on site. The Parish Council considers this to be a material consideration in determining whether the location of the site is suitable.
- 9/. Para 50 of the NPPF requires the L.P.A. to identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing required in a particular location. The P C is not aware that any Housing Needs Assessment has been carried out for Flyford Flavell and does not believe that any such need has been identified in respect to this application. Again, the parish Council considers this a material consideration

in determining the suitability of the location of the site.

- 10/. Para 64 of the NPPF requires that permission should be refused for development that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. The P C does not consider that this application improves the character and quality of the area. The development would constitute block development adjacent to the village and the Parish Council draws attention to the comments made by the Landscape Officer for application 23/00431. This is not appropriate development and offers nothing to the village.
- 11/. The village shop has closed and other services have a very uncertain future. Present bus services amount to the Redditch – Worcester service which passes by on the A422, 4 times a weekday and the Village Hopper service which is once a day. These are very intermittent services and frankly almost all inhabitants use their own transport. It is very unlikely that people of working age would be able to make use of these services and so would rely on their own transport.
- 12/. The proposed development would encourage dependence on the motor car which is contrary to environmental policy of the local planning authority. SWDPR 6 seeks to limit the use of the private car and encourage other forms of sustainable transport. This application would result in much more dependence on the private car and is clearly in contradiction to LPA policy. Again, this is a material consideration concerning the location of the site.
- 13/. An open meeting for residents to express their concerns about applications 23/01682/PIP and 23/01596/PIP was held on 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2023. A considerable number of people highlighted the issue of parking in the village. There is a primary school very close to the proposed development site. Amongst other issues this creates a very real traffic problem in the village with cars parked along the lane and in the vicinity of the school. Further development without the requisite infrastructure improvements is going to exacerbate an already fraught situation which would create a danger to school pupils and members of the public.
- 14/. The planning statement argues that the thread of sustainable development as envisaged in the NPPF is met by this proposal. That is the economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainability. The parish council begs to differ. As previously stated, the area cannot see any discernible economic benefit from the development in the village over the past ten years and sees no reason why this should change because of the development of 2 more dwellings. Furthermore, there are very few opportunities for employment in the village and surrounding area and anyone of working age is likely to need to travel to work by car.
- 15/. The land around Flyford Flavell is generally classed as Grade 3 agricultural land which is deemed to have “moderate limitations that affect the choice of crops to be grown, timing and type of cultivation, harvesting or yield.” The

parish council consider this site to be of agricultural value and the loss of the land would outweigh the gain offered by the development. It is known locally that this particular field has not been ploughed for many years. It has therefore likely developed a very particular ecosystem which could include rare wildflowers and orchids. These are known to exist on the Portway Farm SSSI located 0.34km to the east, pasture behind Tolley's Garage, The Piddle Brook Meadows and on the SSSI in Naunton Beachamp on North Piddle Lane. At the very least the site should be subject to a detailed ecological survey as part of the planning determination. The site should be respected for what it is and in terms of the 'Golden Thread of Sustainability' it is best left alone as a location unsuitable for development because it is an environmental heritage site in the open countryside.

- 16/. The hedgerows are also known to have been undisturbed for a considerable length of time. The hedges are dominated by elm, hawthorn and blackthorn and score a high value of +2 for natural conservation when assessed with the HEGS criteria. Again, the parish council would suggest that a full ecological report on the hedgerows is required before determination of this application.
- 17/. The Five Year Land Supply is not an issue at present due to the adoption of the SWDPR.
- 18/. Recent developments in the village have offered tangible assets to the community. The village green was created in 2016 as a result of the provision of 16 houses. Four affordable houses were provided for the village, two of which are bungalows suitable for elderly people. The developments have either added to the sense of community or infilled in vacant gaps. This proposal does nothing of the sort. It seeks to create disjointed development and provide isolated dwellings which will be dislocated from the village. This is poor use of location and nothing is offered to the community.
- 19/. New policy takes a very different line to development and seeks to concentrate housing into four strategic zones. In future there will be little reliance on development in unsustainable locations such as this application and therefore the concept is out of step with new, fully consulted policy.
- 20/. Access to this site is very poor and a new opening onto New Hill is considered to be a very dangerous proposition. The parish council consider any new access to the hill in this location to be unworkable and believe that the proposed access is illegal. It should be noted that in previous refused application in 2013, 2014 and a subsequent appeal the access was consistently considered to be dangerous and unworkable. The parish council will make further comment on this point if necessary once the Highways comment has been published. This is a salient consideration concerning location.
- 21/. The parish council does not consider that there is safe pedestrian access to the site and village. There is no footway along the carriageway and the grass verges are limited and uneven.

- 22/. The parish council has concerns that the environmental damage caused by the development will outweigh the benefit of the development. The application does not appear to be in line with SWDPR 29 & 30 and there is no detail of where the BNG Units will be provided. There is a strange layout of the proposed road which would appear to provide a future access to further potential development north of the proposed development.
- 23/. Two previous applications 13/01083/OU and 14/02703/OU for similar housing development were made on this site. Both applications were refused. The reasons for refusal of the 2014 application included the following statements:

*The development of this site would therefore be incompatible with the principles of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to resist isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances and to manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of sustainable modes of travel.”*

*“The proposed development will also go against the aims of the development plan to both concentrate most new residential development to sites within or adjacent to urban areas and also to reduce reliance upon private motor vehicles as a means of transport.”*

*‘Given the location of the site, it is likely that the proposal will result in a high dependence upon the private motor vehicle to reach nearby facilities within surrounding villages/towns, given that there is no safe pedestrian access from the site to relevant village facilities.’*

*“The application fails to demonstrate that the application site could accommodate two residential units without significant detrimental harm to the historic and established built character of the village. Due to the nature of the application site, it is reasonable to conclude any development consisting of two units would result in built development sited back from the highway, behind existing residential properties. Such an arrangement would be at odds to the historic and established built form and character of the village. As such the proposals are contrary to saved Policies GD2 and SUR1 of the Wychavon District Local Plan (June 2006); the advice contained within the Residential Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Document); and paragraphs 7 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework”*

*“The submission has failed to reasonably demonstrate that safe vehicular access to serve the proposed development can be achieved off the existing highway network. Furthermore, the proposal fails to demonstrate that suitable pedestrian facilities are available from the site. As such, the proposals are contrary to saved Policy GD2 of the Wychavon District Local Plan (June 2006) and paragraphs 35 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework”*

The parish council believes that little has changed in terms of these policies over the years and that the reasons for refusal ten years ago are still relevant today.

An appeal was made against the refusal of application 14/02703 which was dismissed by the inspectorate. APP/H1840/W/15/3130311

In the summing up of the appeal decision the inspector concluded:

*However, in terms of negative aspects, the proposal would mean that future occupiers of the housing would primarily be dependent on private vehicular transport and, judged in isolation, this consideration would represent a significant negative aspect. However, this is tempered slightly by the fact that there are a limited range of facilities and services available within the*

*village of Flyford Flavell to which future occupiers would have access by cycle and on foot, even if the use of a grass verge rather than a footway is not ideal.*

*The proposal would represent housing development in an open countryside location on an area with some biodiversity value and which is outside of the designated settlement boundary for the village, albeit on the immediate outskirts of the village. As such the proposal would be contrary to saved LP Policy GD1, to which I attach significant weight. Furthermore, although this is an outline application, the layout of the development would conflict with the established character and appearance of the area to an intrusive degree, and thus would not accord with saved Policies GD2 and SUR1 of the LP.*

*When taken as a whole, and in the context of paragraph 49 of the Framework, I therefore conclude that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.*

Although the designation of GD1 land no longer exists the principles enshrined in the NPPF and SWDP protect land where development would be unsustainable and the parish council consider the arguments amount to the same thing.

For these reasons the parish council opposes this application and respectfully asks that it is refused by the Local Planning Authority.

- 24/. Should the planning officer be minded to approve this application the parish council respectfully ask our district member to refer the application to committee.

**Application Number: W/26/00388/FUL**  
**Location: The Homestead**  
**Bishampton Road**  
**Flyford Flavell**  
**WR7 4BU**

**Proposed replacement self-build dwelling with garage and office/store over and relocated access.**

**Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ellis**

The final comment submitted to Wychavon District Council:  
"The Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and North Piddle Parish Council held a meeting open to the public on 21st April and discussed this application. Councillors resolved to object to this application because of the proposals to the entrance and boundary wall which they believe to be out of character with the village. The Parish Council published a Village Design Statement in 2012 and this was subsequently adopted by Wychavon D C as a Local Information Source. The VDS is available on the Parish Council website under Reports, Documents and Policies. The VDS discourages high hedges and boundary walls in the village and provides advice about these matters. Accordingly, the Parish Council consider the proposed design of the entrance gate to be too dominant a feature and out of character with the village. The Parish Council also note and support comments from Highways."

